



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

could probably not count upon. We hope the men sent will be of a moderate and not a radical type; that they will know what to seek for in the way of information and how to interpret it when they find it.

"Real Russia" has been a *terra incognita* to the world since the Revolution, so narrowly partisan and class-conscious have been most of the investigators and commentators who have pretended to tell the world what really was being done in the vast Slavic domain. Honest-minded visitors have too often been denied expression. Governments have relied too exclusively on "intelligence" officers with an almost inevitable bias, owing to their class affiliations and economic preferences. Radicals have gone daft over experiments that had a Utopian dress but a gross body within the libertarian attire. For lack of light, partisans of monarchy, constitutional representative government, and democracy with the group as the basic unit, have been bespattering each other with mud. Powers that controlled navies have kept up a blockade that has put an end to the lives of hundreds of thousands of non-combatants. Wounds have been made that will leave permanent scars, reminding former friends among the nations that they have been enemies, as, for instance, Russia beset by republican France and the United States.

The chapter is one discrediting human nature, political idealism, "open diplomacy," and 20th century journalism.

TAKE NOT THE OPPORTUNITY FROM FRANCE

INTERNATIONAL magnanimity towards central Europe can be initiated only by France.

It is complained, especially by such persons as Mr. Maynard Keynes, in his "The Economic Consequences of Peace," and by Norman Angell, in his "The Peace Treaty and the Economic Chaos of Europe," that M. Clemenceau was opposed to Mr. Wilson's fourteen points, and that throughout the Peace Conference at Paris he drove steadily at one object, namely, to render Germany impotent by means of accumulative poverty and famine. It is pointed out that the population of Germany has increased since 1870 from forty million to nearly seventy million. To feed such a population from within her own borders or to obtain sufficient raw materials from her own resources is impossible. The impressive manufacturing activity of Germany is dependent upon imports. The Paris Treaty aims to cripple Germany's manufacturing industry by making it impossible for her to import either food or raw materials; because, since modern manufacturing depends upon coal, iron, and transportation, M. Clemenceau's statesman-

ship at Paris was bent upon making it impossible for Germany to obtain coal, iron, or transports. It is argued that Germany requires 140,000,000 tons of coal yearly if she is to renew her manufacturing on a scale equal to that of 1914. The loss of the coal mines of the Saar Valley, the obligation of Germany to furnish coal to France, Italy, and to other allies, and the reduction of Germany's territory has reduced the annual coal supply in Germany to 60,000,000 tons. Germany's loss of Alsace-Lorraine means a reduction of three-fourths of her iron supply. Under the terms of the treaty, Germany's mercantile marine practically disappears from the seas. In the light of these facts, Professor Starling reported, in his official calculations, to the British Government that Germany is in position at the present moment to feed less than one-half of her population. Because of her losses in coal, iron, and means of transportation, it is believed that if the present terms of the treaty are enforced that 15,000,000 of the German people will starve to death.

We are presented thus with a distressing picture indeed. Instead of an increasing birth rate, Germany is already face to face with a declining birth rate. Babies are fed a mixture of spinach and water, because neither milk nor other food can be had. New-born children are wrapped in newspapers for the want of other clothes. We are presented with the picture of "starving women tearing in pieces a horse fallen in the street, and eating its raw flesh; the appearance of tuberculosis in shapes hitherto unprecedented, attacking the whole body simultaneously and finally manifesting itself in purulent dissolution." As an economic proposition we are asked, What is to become of this country? It was the best customer of Italy, Belgium, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, and Russia; the second best customer of Great Britain; the third best customer of France. Mr. Norman Angell uses these ominous words:

"A moment's reflection should convince us that a racially and nationally cohesive block of seventy millions, with a gift for discipline and organization, surrounded by smaller States, most of whom are in bitter conflict with one another, cannot be condemned to slow starvation. Somehow, somewhere, they would find a means of breaking out of their prison. By our action we should have given them a righteous cause for war. Then, indeed, they would be fighting for their homes, their women-folk, their little ones, and the war would be waged by a ferocity measured by the ferocity of the doctrine—our doctrine—against which it would be a revolt."

We have no doubt of the substantial accuracy of this picture and we agree that it is terrible. On the top of it all is the new spirit of revenge, transferred now to Germany. The dangers along the Rhine persist. What is to be done?

In the light of the nearly a thousand years of attacks and counter-attacks across this river, it does not seem desirable that the United States should recommend the amelioration of the terms imposed upon Germany. We do not sympathize with Mr. Maynard Keynes nor with Mr. Normal Angell in permitting their lively sympathies for the German suffering to blind them to the suffering in France. France has suffered far more than Germany. Let us get that in our minds. From our point of view, furthermore, the cause of it all started with Germany. It is difficult to understand why we hear so much of the sufferings in Germany and so little of the sufferings in France. A correspondent writes out of eastern France: "The situation is still grave; practically no coal, nor furniture, and no milk. How on earth are we to feed all the tiny babies during the winter, with condensed milk three francs a tin, and very ordinary at that? . . . The economic and financial situation is frightful. Germany does not fulfill the treaty, and it appears that seventy-five years will be necessary to clear and rebuild everything. Seventy-five years! How on earth can France wait? The rate of exchange prevents us from asking help, materials, etc., so it would seem that we shall have to go to Germany for all we need. It's a farce, a cruel, unjust, disgusting farce. . . . After Mr. Wilson has obliged us to go in for the famous League against our own convictions, it really seems a joke, too."

Our feeling is that since there can be no permanent solution of the situation in central Europe save in terms of a peace of reconciliation; and since there can be no feeling of reconciliation within central Europe except through some magnanimous act of the victor, that magnanimous act would be most effective were it to come from France. There can be no real magnanimity from any other source. If, therefore, there are to be any proposals looking toward amelioration of the terms of the treaty, toward "forgiveness" of indebtedness, those steps should be taken first by France. Let the rest of us wait, therefore, upon France in this matter. There is where the magnanimity must start if it is to start anywhere. And France can be magnanimous. There is no doubt of that. Until that magnanimity is forthcoming, England, Italy, and America will do well to remember the devastations, the hungry children, and the dead scattered over pathetic France. Since France did not begin this war; since she has been the innocent sufferer of the greatest of wrongs; since only friendship can heal the wounds; and since friendship can only follow where kindness and magnanimity lead the way, our feeling is that the first step toward that peace of reconciliation, which is the only conceivable basis for peace, must be taken voluntarily by the nation most in danger and by the people who have suffered most.

THE WORLD is not ready for an international organization with unlimited jurisdiction of indefinite definition.

PRESENT DAY international conditions recall the cynical remark of Lord Salisbury, that "national gratitude is a bird whose only natural habitat is the after-dinner speech."

SINCE "MUSIC hath power to soothe the savage breast," it is well to note and to welcome an "international" movement in the realm of music. The International Gregorian Congress will meet in New York City June 1-3.

MAJOR-GENERAL LEONARD WOOD complains that "our untrained men were killed in the war." Are trained men invulnerable to bullets and poison gas, General? The same experienced statesman remarks that "military training is not compulsory training in militarism." General, who are the militarists anyway?

THE BLANKET guarantees under article 10 would have been much more acceptable at this stage of international development had they been specific guarantees in the interest of French safety along the Rhine and of the new republics recently set up.

THE SORT of thing the League of Nations—indeed, every idealistic plan—needs is the establishment of an idea of public right as the governing idea of world politics.

IF THE Council and Assembly are to be, as some claim they will become, mere councils of conciliation, it is the business of a strong and successful federal government such as the United States to make sure of this in advance.

MR. GILBERT K. CHESTERTON in one of his characteristic interviews, emphasizing as usual the superiority of the past to the present, says that "the American Declaration of Independence is soaked in classical antiquity." It is true that Jefferson did know something of the classics; but his chief inspiration was a very recent form of French philosophy; and as for the other signers, most of them went no farther back in their philosophy of revolt than their own experiences as English colonials applying the fundamentals of British law and order and liberty. You cannot make anything Greek or Roman out of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of 1789.

THE PEOPLE all over the United States are demanding decreased taxation, and everybody on the payroll is demanding an increase of salary. How can you reconcile these two demands? said a Congressman in the debate on the Soldiers' Bonus Bill. You cannot satisfy both except you begin way back and teach anew that war depletes treasuries, inflates currencies, upsets family budgets, and makes it sure that lawmakers must face just such an impasse.

THE AMERICAN ARMY in France dealt so fairly and humanly with such German prisoners as came under its control or as they met the captives in camps run by the Allies that now the United States is profiting by the record thus made. As these former prisoners return home they contrast their lot with men who came under the rule of captors of other nations, men who showed hate, not magnanimity and sportsmanship. Justice is a form of capital that pays large dividends in kind. Hate likewise.

THE CANTONS of Switzerland, like the States of the American Union, are free, sovereign, and independent unities. But, quite as in that development of arbitration under the Roman civil law leading to a permanent judiciary out of which developed the Pax Romana, there was a similar development in Helvetia. From 1291 to 1848, disputes between the Cantons of Switzerland were settled in accordance with the principles of arbitration. Then was established a permanent federal tribunal with jurisdiction of civil situations between Cantons; then later over disputes of a public nature. This represents a development similar to that in the United States of America.

THE PREMIER OF JAPAN, in his speech opening Parliament in January, commented on the recent imperial rescript, and said that he was "filled with awe at the profundity and comprehensiveness of the utterances from the throne." This from a Liberal and "Commoner" Prime Minister. Japan cannot adjust herself to the West until she quits this sort of fawning. Unfortunately she has a state religion, the religion of a dynasty heaven-derived; and that, too, must go. At least that is the way it seems to us.

THE LEAGUE so long under discussion in the Senate is seen to have been a radical innovation upon one of America's most treasured political theories, the theory of representative government. There is no doubt that the proposed League of Nations is in form and sub-

stance of the nature of a world empire. That the language of *compulsion* has been softened into the language of a *promise* does not alter the essential accuracy of such a characterization. Leaving out the methods of legislation and of judicial processes, as it does, it is purely executive in its nature; that is to say, being unhampered by either law or court, it is Prussian in its conception and in its dangers.

LET WE FORGET, there remains the Administrative Council of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague. Forty-three nations signed the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, October 18, 1907, twenty-six of whom have ratified the instrument. Our members of the Court are: Hon. George Gray, Hon. Oscar S. Straus, Hon. Elihu Root, and Hon. John Bassett Moore. In one more year the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague will be twenty-one years of age.

THE INEVITABLE movement among nations is toward the settlement of their disputes by arbitration; thence by judicial processes in a permanent court presided over by permanent judges clothed with all the sanctity of judicial responsibility and adjudicating issues between the nations in accordance with the principles of law and equity, which principles of law and equity shall represent the action of accredited representatives of the peoples. Such a movement constitutes the hope of the nations in their attempts to overcome the destructive methods of war. It is a fundamental fact that justice has no relation to might or majority. The evolution of international peace will proceed as it has proceeded between the Swiss Cantons, the parts of the British Empire, and the free, sovereign, independent States of the American Union.

HOW THEY do keep reverting to The Hague as a place for legitimate internationalism to find its solutions. Here is Mr. Frederick Harrison admitting that the plan for trial of Germans under Article 228 of the Treaty is unworkable now and urging that a court be set up at The Hague, made up of the neutral powers only, at which the Entente powers should appear as accusers and their recent German enemy as defendants. A better way has been agreed upon; but the fact that this Liberal veteran talks thus of The Hague indicates that there are still Britons who recall that that city has a recent history which will always make it memorable in the history of international jurisprudence. The nations will come back to it, probably before long. It is inevitable.

BRITISH COLUMBIA and the State of Washington propose to make a park on the boundary line, into which resort their fine State and provincial highway systems will lead from the south and from the north. In the park they plan to erect a suitable memorial of a century and more of peace between Canada and the United States. Fine idea, fine plan of execution, and fine environment!

J. ROBERTSON SCOTT, eminent as a Western journalist, living and writing in Japan, writing in the latest bulletin of the Japan Society, N. Y. City, says that the fundamental reason why Asia is a mystery to the West and the West is a mystery to Asia is because of distrust of each other's morality. How inevitably all problems of international relations come back to ethical tests for final settlement. Mr. Scott's sense of personal duty at this grave juncture in history is taking him back to Asia to establish a review that will help break down the distrust and dispel the mystery. Why? Because war, that flows out of distrust and alienation, must be avoided if progress is not to prove to be a dream and civilization an illusion.

THE WAR DEPARTMENT has been holding an "Essay Contest," in which the students of all schools, except colleges and universities, whether public, private, sectarian, or non-sectarian, were invited to participate. The subject chosen was "What are the Benefits of an Enlistment in the United States Army?" The board of judges was composed of Secretary Baker, General Peyton C. March, General John J. Pershing. The principals of all schools were urged to co-operate in every way possible in this great contest conducted by the officers of the Army Recruiting Service. One instinctively wonders why so much energy has to be spent in order to recruit our army and navy forces. We judge that the common sense of our young men is something of a factor in the situation.

THE PICTURE of one man voting in a foreign city, one only of five, deciding the fate of over 100,000,000 of people, has not appealed to the majority of the American people. In short, the unrepresentative action providing for the whole project has seemed like a leap in the dark, a rehabilitation of that ancient and outgrown system of one-man power, a system invariably ending in riot and revolution. The American people are accustomed to the negotiations of treaties by the method of commissioners reporting to the President, who in turn submits the instrument for the advice and consent of the Senate. They have not been able to un-

derstand, and they have not therefore been able to approve, of the President's appointing himself as his own ambassador to Paris; but, more particularly, they have not been able to accept the principle of one-man power—a theory peculiar to the "League" itself.

WHEN THE HISTORY of the period through which Americans are passing comes to be written by a historian who can view men and their deeds with something approximating objective dispassionateness, it will be seen that some of our wisest counselors in the United States were business men and financiers of large caliber—men like Mr. Hoover, Mr. Vanderlip, and Mr. Davison, all of whom have studied conditions in Europe at first hand. For instance, contemplate the words of Mr. Vanderlip, addressed to the Economic Club of New York City, February 25. He said: "The world will never be safe for democracy until democracy is intelligent." He added the opinion that if the \$750,000,000 which the majority party in the Senate wish to spend on universal military training were "put into universal training in the principles of government and economics, America will be safe for democracy."

GERMAN-AMERICAN as well as German comment upon the service that the American Friends are rendering in Germany as almoners of funds contributed in the United States and of supplies furnished by Mr. Hoover is fervently appreciative, and there bids fair to be no finer chapter in the history of the Quakers of the United States than this one. Their constructive, social, soul-cheering work done in Russia and in France during the war had fitted them experimentally for this work in Germany; and their humane attitude toward all persons, their evident piety as well as good-will, and their special beliefs make them welcome in a peculiar way to a people as distraught, suspicious, and undecided as to the meaning of life as many of the Germans are now. One of the workers in this cause is a member of the New Hampshire Peace Society, Rev. F. T. Libbey, of the faculty of Phillips Exeter Academy, himself not a Quaker. He has had experience working in France under the Friends' Service Committee, and leaves the country again in April, to visit the six countries where the Friends are carrying on this relief work.

CAREFUL READERS of the ADVOCATE during the past two months will have noted that, however moribund the "peace" societies of other States may be, the New Hampshire Society is busy functioning. It is finding that public opinion is more tolerant than it was dur-

ing the war; that organizations of an educational sort welcome discussion of the conflicting issues involved in the League of Nations' plan, and that substantial people of the New Hampshire communities are willing to hold office in the society and work for it. The hope that the 1914-'18 combat was really a "war against war," and that when peace finally came it would disclose a world so nauseated by war that it would "turn from its vomit," to use a good scriptural phrase, is passing. There were persons, who in ordinary times show much discrimination, who were saying, no longer than fifteen months ago, that it was time to "scrap" the peace societies. The grim fact seems to be that never were they more needed.

A WRITER in the *Manchester Guardian* of March 5, 1920, has expressed himself frankly about the Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick Pollock's "The League of Nations." Mr. Pollock, having taken the position in his book that Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations simply makes it possible for the Council to "advise" rather than to "prescribe" the action to be taken by each member of the League, the critic now pertinently remarks, "But this does not get over the fact that the obligation remains." The critic also suggests another thing, something that had escaped our attention, namely, that the British dominions and India, by putting their signatures to the Covenant, have thereby appointed themselves to defend Poland, Roumania, and Czechoslovakia against external aggression, "while they have no corresponding obligations, either conciliatory or by treaty, to defend the mother country." He also adds significantly the following remark: "The author makes no reference to the agreement of November 5, 1918, by which the Allies accepted the 'Wilson terms' as the basis for the armistice. It would be interesting to know what he regards as the standing of that agreement in international law and what he thinks of its undoubted violation in the Treaty of Versailles."

GIVEN an army, what does common sense dictate as to care for the moral and spiritual welfare of the soldiers? Experimentation, during 1914-'18, with the traditional system of chaplains and also with a newly created set of agencies managed by laymen, taught the American War Department much that never before had been dreamed of in its philosophy. It is now making the army's morale department include much of the service rendered by the Y. M. C. A., the Knights of Columbus, and similar organizations, and it is maintaining a training school for chaplains at Camp Sherman, Ohio. The "sects" no longer can unload upon the army men who had failed as clergymen in civil life. Where light now is needed seems to be in Congress, and it is against that

citadel of conservative parsimony that the Federal Council of Churches and its allies are driving. They plan to secure for the chaplains the rank, pay, and defined status that they must have if the army is to get men of caliber for a work that at best is difficult and unrewarded.

CLEMENCEAU had his virtues as a war premier and certain defects as a peace negotiator, but he must be given credit for declining the gift from France of an estate in his native Vendee. "I will not accept a reward for anything I have been able to do for France," he said. The American Legion of Honor officials and the rank and file of the A. E. F. would do well to con this saying, as they assail Congress in behalf of a "bonus" system that involves the expenditure of several billions.

GERMANY'S academic and political agents and agencies were so closely intertwined under the old monarchical régime that it was inevitable that when the war came the university professors should be the most ardent "patriots" and defenders of the imperial policy. Probably nothing equaled in its "shock" effect upon Great Britain and the United States the manifesto issued by men like Harnack, Ostwald, and Meyer, in which not only the national policy, but the military tactics used in the Belgian invasion were approved. Today, under a republican régime, with a former saddler for President, the German university professor has to adjust himself to quite a different social and political environment; and for many of them the process will be difficult. There is nothing admirable in the way both the students and the authorities of Berlin University have dealt with Nicolai, the biologist, author of "Biology and War" and a sharp critic of the militarist policy of the old régime. At first welcomed back from his safe retreat in Switzerland, he at last has been told to quit his academic post; and since he says that he would like to live and teach in the United States, why not find an opening for him here?

THE *Evening Post* of New York is quite pleased with that portion of the report of the Industrial Conference which leaves the enforcement of unanimous findings by the National Board of Appeal wholly to the good faith of the parties who have agreed to abide by such decision. In a recent editorial in this paper we read: "If industry wants peace, the way of peace has been pointed out. If it wants war, no set of machinery will prevent war." Surely that is sound doctrine. But of this valiant defender of the alliance to enforce peace proposed in the Covenant of the League of Nations, we would respectfully inquire why the same principle does not apply in the matter of international disputes?